3901.a.5

THE CENSVRE OF THE SACRED FACVLTIE OF DIVINITIE OF PARIS,

AGAINST THE FOVRE BOOKES concerning the Eccleſiaſtical cõmonvvealth,

COMPOSED BY

MARCVS ANTONIVS DE DOMINIS,
Archbishop of Spalata:

Printed at London by Iohn Bill. 1617.

Tranſlated by a Student in Diuinitie. To vvhich alſo is added a Preface to the Reader.

Academiæ ... Univ. de France.

K

Printed at Dovvay,
By the Widdovve of L. KELLAM,
and Thomas his ſonne.

M. DC. XVIII.

Hæc cenſura ſacræ facultatis Pariſienſis in quatuor priores Libros de repub. Eccleſiaſtica Marci Antonij de Dominis fideliter in linguam Anglicam tranſlata, addita præfatione, vtiliter excudetur. Actum Duaci, 7. Martij 1618.

GEORGIVS COLVENERIVS
S. Theol. Doctor & Profeſſor,
Academiæ Duacenæ Cancellarius, & librorum Cenſor.

A PREFACE TO THE READER.

GENTHE READER.

HEARING leaſt the ſplendour and luſtre of the late reuolted Archbiſhop of Spalata his dignitie, & the painted hewe of wiſdome & learning, of which he maketh only a ſhew & flourish in his great bookeſet forth againſt the Catholique Churches Hierarchie and Monarchie, may daſle the eyes, and delude alſo the vnderſtanding of the vnlearned, who may imagine noe litle euil in the Romaine Church which he hath left and forſaken, though in it, and by it, he enioyed no ſmal liuings & honours, noe litle good in the Proteſtantes Church & Religion, to which with ſuch loſſe, he is now aſſociated: I haue thought good to publish in our English tongue, the late Cenſure of the learned Doctours of Sorbon, that they who vnderſtand not Latin, may ſee what their opinion is of his booke, and that it was but a vaine bragge of an Apoſtata, to father his doctrine touching the equalitie of the Apoſtles & Bishops their Succeſſours, vppon ſo learned and Catholique a Colledge of Diuines. 1.

For

2. For how could these Doctours, who euer haue been holden for learned Catholiques, and who censured Luthers articles euen in the beginning, either hold that there was equalitie in the Apostles, or that Peter was not Cheeftaine & Head amongst them, this equalitie hauing been condemned in Marsilius Patauinus, wicleffe, Hus, Luther, and Caluin? Or how could they without Censure of the Romaine Church auouche the like equalitie in Bishops with the Romaine Bishop S. Peters succeſſour, this also hauing been censured as an hereſie in the Patriarch of Constantinople (who being backed by the Emperour would needs be called an vniuersal Bishop and not subiect to the Bishop of Rome) and in the aforsaid heretiques, who that they might dogmatize the more freely and without controlment, as they equalized all the Apostles to Peter, so they made al Bishops fellow mates in Authoritie with the Pope his succeſſour.

3. The Sorbon Doctours confeſſe with al Catholiques, that Christ is still the onlie absolute supreme Head and Pastour of the Church, & *Foundation beſides vvhich no man can put anie other*, in the same kind and degree: but yet they and al Catholiques auouche, that Christ subtracting his visible presence from his Church militant, and not speaking in an audible voice to determine cõtrouersies, nor conuersing visiblie to gouerne & rule therin;

Epheſ. 1.
4. ſ Coll.
1. Zach.
10. Ioan.
10. Heb.
13.
1. Cor. 3.

hath

hath left a visible vice-regent, subiect & subordinate to him selfe, but superiour to the whole Church, and the rest of her Bishops and Pastours.

For if the gouernment of the Church had been left to al Bishops equallie, who should haue summoned and called these Bishops to consultation and definition in Councelles? For if al be equal, euerie one may refuse to go to the Councel, and he hauing noe Superiour, who can controlle him? But suppose they should by common consent assemble them selues together; when matters are debated and disputed in the Councel, who shal determine and pronounce the sentence from which there is no appeale? wherfore as whileſt Christe liued, he him selfe was the onlie Supreme visible Head, so he leauing vs, it was necessarie he should appoint a supreme and visible vicegerent with full and infallible Authoritie to enact general lawes, to define verities, to condemne heresies, to cal & confirme Councels, to determine controuersies, which in euerie age are raised by heretiques, and so to conserue the Church in puritie and vnitie of doctrine. Otherwise if Christ had left this authority equally to al Bishops without subordination to one, he had not so well prouided for conseruation of this vnitie, it being hard for manie not subordinate to one, to agree in one opinion. But hauing appointed one supreme visible Head, and subordina- 4.

ted al the reſt to him, it is eaſier for them to agree in one, and it is alſo eaſier for the reſt of Chriſtians to obey one or manie ſubordinate to one, then to obey manie independent commaunders.

5. Hence it is that our Bleſſed Sauiour long before his death promiſed S. Peter for that his ſo worthie a confeſſion of his diuinitie expreſſed in thoſe words. *Tu es Chriſtus filius Dei viui*; *Thou art Chriſt the Sonne of the liuing God*; that he would make him the rocke and foundation of the Church, ſaying: *Tu es Petrus & ſuper hanc petram ædificabo Eccleſiam meam*: *Thou art Peter, and vppon this rocke I will build my Church.* where by theſe wordes (*this rocke*) can neither be vnderſtood Chriſt, nor the faith of Chriſt, as our Reformers would haue it, but Peter, of whom only and not of Chriſt or the faith of Chriſte, mention was made immediatlie before. So that to Peter Chriſte promiſed that he should be the rocke and foundation on which he would build his Church, and ſeeing a Foundation, and Head, in a myſtical bodie, is al one, it followeth that he promiſed to Peter that he should be Head to his Church, and conſequentlie made him ſoe, elſe he that is veritie it ſelfe, had not been as good as his word. Wherfore Chriſte indeed did accordinglie perfourme his promiſe, when after his reſurrection, in the preſence of other his Apoſtles, he ſingled out Peter, and finding by queſtioning, that he loued him aboue

Mat. 16.

aboue al the reſt, he bad him *feed his Lambes and sheepe*, that is leſſer and greater Chriſtians, euen Bishops, ſaying: *Paſce agnos meos, paſce oues meas, feed my Lambes, feed my sheepe.* which argueth that as he ſpake to Peter and not to the reſt though preſent, and as he found that Peter loued him aboue the reſt, ſo he gaue to him another and greater paſtoral authoritie, then he at other times gaue to them; and ſeing he gaue them al extraordinarie authoritie ouer al the Church, he gaue to him an ordinarie authoritie not only ouer the Church, but euen ouer the other Apoſtles. If then S. Peter should haue demaunded of the reſt of th'Apoſtles, whether they acknowledged them ſelues for the Sheepe of Chriſte, they could not haue denied, vnleſse they would haue denied them ſelues Chriſtians; and then Peter might haue inferred, that if they bee Chriſts sheepe they are his alſo, becauſe Chriſt cõmitted al his sheepe to Peter, ſaying: *Paſce oues meas, feed my sheep*; and then might Peter againe haue ſubſumed; if you Apoſtles be my sheep I am your Paſtour, and ſo your Superiour? Ioan. 21. Ioan. 21.

6. The ancient Fathers grounding them ſelues one thoſe twoe places of Scripture, do with one conſent plainly auerre that S. Peter was Head of the Church, and euen of the other Apoſtles. CLEMENS ROMANVS [a] calles him *Eccleſiæ fundamentũ, the foundation of the Church*, and *Apoſtolorum primum, the firſt of the Apoſtles*, not

[a] Ep. 1. ad Iac. frat. Domini.

not in vocation to the Apoſtleship, for S. Andrew was called before him, but in authoritie and dignitie. [b] DIONISIVS AREOPAGITA ſtiles him *ſupremum decus & antiquiſſimum Theologorum columen, the chiefeſt glorie and moſt auncient ſtay of the Diuines.* HYPPOLITVS [d] honoureth him with theſe titles: *Princeps Petrus, fidei petra, quem beatum iudicauit Chriſtus Dominus noſter, ille Doctor Eccleſiæ, ille primus diſcipulorum: Peter the Head ruler, the rocke of faith, whome Chriſt our Lord iudged happie, he the Doctor of the Church, the firſt of the Diſciples.* ORIGENES [e] feareth not to call him *Apoſtolorum principem, the Prince of the Apoſtles.* PETRVS ALEXANDRINVS, [f] S. BASIL & EPHREM, [h] CYRILLVS ALEXANDRINVS [i] giue him the ſame title of honour. EPIPHANIVS [k] calleth him *the Captaine of the Diſciples.* S. CHRYSOSTOME [l] called him *the mouth, the prince, and Head of the Apoſtles.* ISIDORVS PELVSIOTA [m] tearmes him *Apoſtolici ſodalitij Coryphœum, the ringleader of the Apoſtolicall compaignie.* The COVNCIL of CALCEDON [n] ſaith Peter is *Petra & Crepido Catholicæ Eccleſiæ, the Rocke of the Catholique Church, & bancke breaking the aduerſe waters.* S. CYPRIAN hath manie pregnant places for S. Peters Headship and Supremacie: as where he ſaith [o] *Cathedra vna ſuper Petrum Domini voce fundata: One chaire by the voice of our Lord founded on Peter.* And againe: [p] *Primatus Petro datur, vt vna Chriſti Eccleſia, & Cathedra vna monſtretur. The Primacie*

[b] l de diuin: nom c. 3.
[d] Orat. de conſum. mũdi.
[e] Hom. 17 in Luc
[f] Serm de pœnit
[g] In proem præcep
[h] in Panoplia.
[i] li. 10 in Ioa. c. 41.
[k] hær. 51.
[l] hom. 87 in Ioan.
[m] c. 142.
[n] Act. 3.
[o] Ep. 40.
[p] lib de vnit. Eccl

is

is giuen to Peter, that one Church of Christ, and one Chaire may be shewed. S. AMBROSE likewise. q Soli Petro gratia primatus inter Apostolos est concessa: To onlie Peter the grace of primacie amongest the Apostles is graunted. and in an other place: r Petrum sequutus est. And eas Saluatorem quam Petrum, & tamen primatum non accepit Andreas sed Petrus. Andrew followed our Sauiour before Peter, and yet Andrew receiued not the Primacie but Peter: OPTATVS: s In vna Roma Petro primo Cathedra Episcopalis est collata, in qua sedit omnium Apostolorum caput Petrus, vnde & Cephas appellatus est. In the Citie of Rome to Peter first an Episcopal Chaire was giuen, in which Peter the Head of all the Apostles sat, where vpon also he was called Cephas. S. HIEROME t Propterea inter duodecim vnus eligitur, vt capite constituto Schismatis tollatur occasio. Therefore amongest twelue one is chosen, that the Head being constituted, occasion of Schisme may be taken away. S. AVGVSTINE: u Ipsum constituit caput eorum, vt pastor esset gregis Domini: He made him Head of them (to wit of the Apostles) that he might be Pastor of the flocke of our Lorde. And againe. vv Quis nescit primum omnium Apostolorum esse Beatissimum Petrum. vvho knoweth not most Blessed Peter to be the first of all the Apostles. And againe. x In Apostolo Petro primatus Apostolorum excellenti gratia præeminet. In the Apostle Peter the primacie of the Apostles with an excellent grace is preeminent S. LEO the first surnamed the GREATE: y Vnus de toto mundo Petrus eligitur, qui & vniuersarum Gentium voca-

q in c. 2. ad Gal.

r in c. 2. ep. 2. ad Cor.

s. lib. 2. cont Donat.

t lib. 1. aduerf. Iouin.

u q. 7. quæst. vet. & no. Test.

vv Tract. 56. in Io.

x lib. 2. de Bapt.

y serm. 3. in Anniuer. Assump.

tioni, & omnibus Apostolis, cunctisque Ecclesiæ Patribus præponatur. One Peter is chosen out of the whole Worlde, who both to the Vocation of all Nations and to all the *Apostles*, and all the *Fathers of the Church may be made ouerseer and ruler.* Manie moe Fathers expresse testimonies Iudocus Coccius.[z] Cardinal Bellarmine,& others do alleage, but these are sufficient: and by these we may see,that there is as good proofe for S. Peters supremacie, as there is for the Sacred Trinitie, for no greater proofe can be alleaged for the Trinitie then the Text of Scripture, and the exposition of Ancient Fathers, Councels,and Tradition; and that wee haue for S. Peters Supremacie, as may partlie be seen, partlie be gathered by the testimonies alleaged.

z tom. 1. lib. 7.

7. And for as muchas the Church had as much need and perchaunce more of a Supreme visible Pastour after S Peter, as in his time, it followeth that as Bishops succeed to other Apostles, so some Cheefe Bishope in the Church must be S Peters successour, superiour to other Bishops,who must gouerne,rule, define & determine controuersies. And who else can make any shew of claime to this Authoritie but the Bishop of Rome. For first it is certaine that S. Peter (whom hetherto I haue proued to haue been Bishope of the whole Church) was euen to his death Bishop of Rome, and consequentlie the Bishop of Rome and of the whole world, in S. Peter

was

was all one.

That S. Peter liued and died in Rome, and founded that Church, and gouerned it, many Ancient Fathers both Latin & Greeke (whom Ivdocvs Coccivs in his *first Tome* and *seuenth booke* and *fifte Article* produceth, doe clearlie and expreſſelie affirme. And to omit thoſe Autours who onlie ſay he liued, died & preached at Rome, Evsebivs Cæsariensis. Pronounceth thus of him: *Petrus natione Gallæus, Christianorum Pontifex primus, cum primum Antiochenam fundaſſet Eccleſiam, Romam proficiſcitur, vbi Euangelium prædicans, viginti quinque annis eiuſdem vrbis Epiſcopus perſeuerat. Peter by nation a Gallean, the firſt Bishop of the Christians when firſt he had founded the Church of Antioche, he went to Rome, where preaching the Goſpel, fine & twentie yeares he remained Bishop of the ſame Citie* Epiphanivs reckening the Bishops of Rome putteth S. Peter in the firſt place. Tertvllian ſaith, Peter ſat firſt at Rome and appointed Linus after him. S. Cyprian admireth the audacitie of the heretiques of his time, who endeuoured to get cõmunicatorie letters from the Church of Rome, which he calleth *the principal Church from which vnitie ſpringeth*, & in an other Epiſtle he ſaith that Cornelius was choſen Bishop of Rome, *Cum Fabiani locus (id eſt) cum locus Petri, & gradus Cathedræ Sacerdotalis vacaret. when the place of Fabian, (that is) when the place of Peter, & degree of Prieſtlie Chaire was vacant.* S. Ambrose ſtileth S. Peter *Prieſt of*

8. In Chro. Her. 27. l. 3. Carm. c. 9. Ep. 56. Ep. 52. l. 3 de ſacram.

the Romain Church, for no other cauſe then for that he was Bishop of Rome. OPTATVS ſaith as much: *Negare non potes ſcire te in vrbe Roma Petro primo Cathedram Epiſcopalem ſſe collatam, in qua ſederit omnium Apoſtolorũ Caput Petrus, vnde & Cephas dictus eſt. Thou canſt not deny but thou knoweſt in the citie of Rome firſt of all the Epiſcopal ſeate to haue been giuen to Peter, In which Peter the Head of al the Apoſtles ſatte, whence alſo he was called Cephas.* S. Hierome ſaith, that Peter the prince of the Apoſtles after he had been Bishop of Antioche, went to Rome in the ſecond yeare of Claudius to confound Simon Magus, and there for the ſpace of 25. yeares *Cathedrum Sacerdotalem tenuit, he held the Prieſtlie Chaire*, S Auguſtine makes this demaund, *Cathedra tibi quid fecit Eccleſiæ Romanæ, in qua Petrus ſedit, et in qua hodie Anaſtaſius ſedet? what hath the ſeate of the Church of Rome done to thee, in which Peter hath ſitten, and in which this day Anaſtaſius ſitteth?* And reckening vp the Bishops of Rome, he beginnes with *Peter*, and goeth on with *Linus, Clemens, Anacletus, Euariſtus, Alexander, Sixtus, Teleſphorus, Iginus, Anicetus, Pius, Soter, Eleutherius, Victor, Zepherinus, Calixtus, Vrbanus, Pontianus*, euen to *Anaſtaſius*. Proſper giues this Teſtimonie:

Sedes Roma Petri, quæ paſtoralis honoris
Facta caput mundo, quicquid non poſſidet armis,
Relligione tenet
Great Rome S. Peters Seat, of Paſtours dignitie
Is made an Head vnto the vvorld; & vvhat by Cheualrie
Shee neuer did atchieue, nor vvinne by dint of ſvvord,
Subdu'd she hath by Godlineſſe, and preaching of the vvord.

l. 2. cont. Donatiſt.

l. de viriſ illuſt. c. 1.

l. 2. cont. lit. petil. c. 51.

Ep 165.

In promiſſ. & prædict. c. 5.

S.

Saint Bernard (to omitte manie others whom Iudocus Coccius relateth l. 7. cit. ar. 6.) whose affirmatiue voice I hope is, better then an Apostataes negatiue, speaketh thus to Eugenius Pope and Bishope of Rome. *Age inda-gemus adhuc diligentius qui sis &c. Goe to, let vs yet search out more diligentlie who thou art, whose person thou beares for the time in the Church of God. who art thou? The great Priest, th Chiefst Bishop. Thou art Prince of the Bishops, thou art heire to the Apostles, Thou art in primacie Abel, in gouernment Noe, in Patriarchship Abraham, in Order Melch sedech, in dignitie Aaron, in Authoritie Moyses, in the office of iudge Samuel, in power Peter, in vnction Christe. Thou* (Eugenius pope of Rome) *art he to whom* (in Peter) *the Keyes were giuen, the sheepe committed. There are others indeed that are porters of Heauen & pastours of Flockes, but thou so much the more gloriouslie by how much the more differentlie hast aboue others inherited both names. They haue flockes assigned them, seueralles to seuerall, to thee al flockes are committed, one to one. Neither art thou pastoure only of the sheep, but al of al the pastours. Thou demandest how I proue that? Out of the word of our Lord. For to whom, I say not of the bishops, but euen of the apostles, so absolutelie and with out distinction were al the sheepe comitted? If thou louest me, Peter, feed my sheepe: which? the people of that, or that Citie, of that nation or kingdome? my sheep, he sayth. Who seeth not plainlie that he designed not some certaine, who assigned all? nothing*

Coccius l. 7 Thesauri. ar. 6. Bernard. l. 3 de consid. ad Eugen.

is excepted, where nothing is distinguished. And a little after continuing his speech to the same Pope, he concludeth thus: *To be breefe, Iames who seemed to be a pillar of the church, was content with Hierusalem onlie, yeelding to Peter the Wolle world. The brother of our Lord yeelding* (to Peter) *who else can thrust himselfe into Peters prerogatiue? Therefore according to thy Canons others are called to part of the sollicitude, thou to the fulnes of powre. Others power is restrained within certaine limits, thine is extended euen to them who haue receiued power ouer others. Canst not thou when there is cause, shut heauen to a Bishop* (by excomunication) *depose him from his Bishoprick, and deliuer him vp to Satan?*

2. By al this who, so blind that can not see, that the Bishop of Rome hath euer been taken for the supreme visible Head of the Church, true Successour to S. Peter, and Pastour of al Christes sheepe? If then the Bishop of Rome should demaũd of al the Bishops of the Christian world euerie one remaining in his Bishopricke, or al assembled in a general Councel, whether they be not the Sheep of Christ, they can not denie, vnles they wil deny them selues Christians. And thẽ he might subsume, if you be Christs sheep, you are also Peters sheep, for to him Christ cõmitted al his sheep without limitatiõ or exception. If you be Peters sheep, you are my sheepe, because I am Peters lawful succesiour in al fulnesse of Pastoral Authoritie, as all the auncient Fathers auerre:

auerre: If you be my sheep, I am your Pa-
ſtour, if I be your Paſtour, your are ſubiectes,
I am Superiour to you al, euen in a general
Councel, for euen there you ceaſe not to be
Chriſt his sheep.

Away then with this reuolted Archbishops 10.
Ariſtocracie and equalitie of Bishops, I haue
proued by Scriptures and Fathers that the
Gouernment of the Church is monarchical,
in which firſt Chriſt, then Peter his cheef Vi-
caire, then the Bishop of Rome Chriſts vi-
caire and Peters ſucceſſour, ſitteth at the
ſterne, gouerneth, and ruleth. Hence it is that
the Bishop of Rome, and none but hee, hath
conſtituted & depoſed, & excõmunicated Bi-
shops out of the particular dioceſſe of Rome:
By his Authority general Councels haue been
called; by him they haue been confirmed,
which confirmation argueth ſuperioritie o-
uer a general Councel, for it is not for an infe-
riour to confirme the decrees of his ſuperi-
ours: In them by his legates he hath directed,
gouerned, and borne the Cheefeſt ſway: To
him appellations haue euer been made from
all ſentences, which argueth him to be the ſu-
preme Iudge: To him the Fathers, councelles,
kinges, and Emperours, haue euer giuen the
precedence aboue all and next vnto Chriſt in
Eccleſiaſtical power and dignitie, as by the
Fathers writinges, and Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtories
I could make moſt euident, and as cleare as
the ſunne. By this it may appeare not only
how

how contrarie to Scripture and Fathers this Archbishops equalitie of Bishops is, they all giuing to S. Peter superioritie ouer the other Apostles, and to the Bishop of Rome supremacie ouer other Bishops; but also what open wrong and iniurie he offereth to the learned Doctours of Sorbon, who cõfesse the Bishop of Rome to be the supreme visible Head of the Church, and consequently the Churches gouernment to be Monarchical not Aristicratical, and can not teache otherwise, without euident note of heresie. But no maruaile that he fathereth his heresie vppon so venerable a Faculty of diuines, sithe it hath been an old practise of heretiques to father their heresies, as much as in them did lie, euen vppon the Bishop of Rome, by endeuouring to get by stealth, comunicatory letters frõ that Church, whose Authority they knew was the greatest vnder the Cope of Heauen S. Cyprian speaking of the Donatists saith, *Post ista adhuc insuper pseudoepiscopo sibi ab haereticis constituto nauigare audent, & ad Petri Cathedrã atque ad Ecclesiam principalem, vnde vnitas Sacerdotalis exorta est, a Schismaticis & prophanis literas ferre, nec cogitare eos esse Romanos (quorum fides Apostolo praedicante laudata est) ad quos perfidia non possit habere accessum. After these thinges, a false Bishop being cõstituted for thē by heretiques, they dare saile & carrie letters from Schismatiques and prophane persons to Peters Chaire, & to the principal Church, from which priestly vnitie is sprong, and they doe not*

l. 1. Ep. 3. ad Cornelium.

Rom. 1.

not consider that they are Romanes (whose faith by the Apostle is commended) vnto whom perfidiousnes can not haue accesse. So the EVSEBIANS, as witnesseth ATHANASIVS, sought to be counenaunced by Liberius Pope. Rom. 1. Epist ad solit vit. agent.

And although this Censure alleageth neither Scriptures nor Fathers against the Archbishops equalitie of Bishops, & other his manifold heresies, yet thou must not Gentle Reader, thinke it therfore to be deficient, or insufficient. For as Popes, and Councels do not vse to refute heresies in their Canons by arguments, but onlie condemne and anathematize them, presuming their Authoritie to be sufficient to discountenaunce all heresies; so this learned facultie of Diuines and Sorbon Doctours, in Censures vseth not (as neither do other faculties when they Censure any opinions) to refute heresies by argumẽts, but counteth it sufficient to condemne them by Authoritie; though the said Doctours could, and perchance some of them will refute also this Archbishops booke by all mãner of argumẽts grounded in Scriptures, Councels, Fathers, Ecclesiastical Histories, and diuinitie. For if the Pithagoreans, as *Aulus Gellius* reporteth, bare such respect to their Master *Pithagoras*, that they were content to harken only, not to aske questions, & held it sufficient that αυτος ἐφα *ipse dixit, he said it*, much more should the onlie word and censure of so learned a facultie, without all proofes, arguments, or reaLi. 1. c 19.

sons, content and satisfie any reasonable man. For he that wil not be satisfied with such Authoritie, is vnreasonable, and so would not be satisfied with reason.

Be not then dismaied, O Gentle Reader, if thou see an Archbishop of *Spalata* countenaunce the Protestants Religion, & their Apostasie frō the Church of Rome, for what is he to so many graue, learned, holie, and Auncient Fathers, who are linked to the Church of Rome, & do grace her with supremacie? *& what* (as S. Paule saith) *if certaine of them haue not beleeued? Hath their incredulitie made the faith of God frustrate? God forbid.* Is it any maruaile that heretiques impugne the Church, & leaue her, th'Apostle auerring that *there must be heresies*? Nay it is a signe of the true Church: *They went out from vs* (saith S. Ihon) *but they were not of vs; for if they had been of vs, they would haue staied with vs.* It is no more maruaile that heresies, then that agues or plagues infect thē that haue no preseruatiues against thē. What wonder, when the wind of ambition, enuie, or some other passion bloweth, that the chaff fly away? The good wheate will not stirre, rather it will remaine purer. Lucifer fell from the highest heauen, the aerial and false starres from the aerial heauen, what maruaile if an Archbishop fall from the Church, the kingdome of Heauē? Adam was expelled Paradise, Saule was deposed from his kinglie throne, Dauid by a tentatiō fell from his Innocencie;

1.Cor.11.

1.Ioan.2.

Mat.13.

Salo-

Salomon by the loue of women was throwne downe frō the high reputation which he had with God and man; what wonder then that a Bishop turne his Coate & fall from his profession? It was a great tentation, as VINCENTIVS LYRINENSIS hath obserued, when NESTORIVS Patriarch of Cōstātinople gratious to the Emperour, popular amōgst the people; whē PHOTINVS famous for his eloquence in Greeke & Latin; when APPOLLINARIS who had written thirtie bookes against Porphyrius, fell frō the Catholike Church, & began to be ringleaders of rebelles agaīst her: but as the same Authour saith none was so great a scandall & tentation as Origen, who for his pietie, zeale, & chastity, was inferiour to none, for his learning surpassed all the Doctours of his time, yea, who had many Doctours & Martyrs for his Schollers, who was so famous, that frō all Coūtries many flocked vnto him, as to an other Salomō, as to an oracle; and yet this so great Doctour, this pillar of the Church, falling by trusting to much to his owne witte, relying to litle on the traditiōs & Authority of the Church, was a tentation & cause of ruine to many of those, whose weakenes before he supported. What a tentation was Lucifer Calaritanus, who puffed vp with a conceite of his glory he had purchassed by his cōstant confession, by his bookes writtē, & liberty of speech against Cōstantius, and the great zeale he had shewed for Athanasius and the Catholique cause, and repining

l. cont. Proph. har. nouit. c. 16.

Cap. 18.

at the receiuing of thoſe that had fallen, fell from the Church himſelfe as the Angell Lucifer did from heauen, and became the Captain of the Luciferian band. This his fall was ſo great a tentation, and cauſed ſuch mourning in the Church, that as Baronius noteth, she cõplained in effect in this lamentable manner. *Quomodo cecidiſti de cœlo Lucifer qui mane oriebaris*, *how art thou fallen frõ Heauen Lucifer who in the morning didſt riſe. Vlula Abies quia cecidit cedrus: Howle thou firre tree becauſe the Cedar is fallen*? No leſſe tentatiõ was the fall of Tertullian famous for his workes written againſt hereticks, as the ſaid Vincẽtius Lirinenſis declareth. The reuolt of this Archbiſhop is no ſuch tentation, becauſe he was neuer a man ſo famous either for vertue or learning, yea ſo obſcure, that France, England, & the Netherlandes had neuer heard of him, had not his infamous Apoſtaſie gotten him a name, though no better then he that fired Dianaes Temple, purchaſſed. But theſe tentations muſt not moue men of wiſdome, & cõſideration, who know that the higheſt trees & mountaines are more ſubiect to winds and Tempeſts: and yet the low trees and hilles muſt not fall becauſe thoſe great Cedars and mountaines doe. For although (as Moyſes ſaith) *a falſe Prophet ſhal ariſe, & tell dreames & viſions, & fortell wonders, & ſhal coũſell vs to follow falſe Goddes* or doctrines, yet wee muſt giue no eare vnto him: & why? becauſe ſaith he, *tentat vos Dominus Deus veſter, vt palam fiat*

Baro. to. 4 an. 362.

Eſa. 14.

Zach. 11.

Cap. 23.

Deut. 13.

vtrum

vtrum diligatis eum an non, in toto corde & tota a-nima vestra: your Lord, God tempteth you, that it may appeare whether you loue him or noe with al your hart and with all your sowle. But what if a great Doctour, Bishop, or Archbishop fall, must the Church which is builded on a rocke fall with such reedes? Harken what counsel *Tertullian* giueth in such a case: *Quid ergo si Episcopus, si Diaconus, si vidua, si virgo, si Doctor, si etiam martyr lapsus a regula fuerit, ideo hæreses veritatem videbuntur obtinere? ex personis probamus fidem, an ex fide personas?* What then if a Bishop, if a deacon, if a Widow, if a Virgin, if a Doctour, if a designed Martyr shal fall from the Rule (of faith) *shal therfore hereſies obteine to be counted as veritie? Do wee proue our faith by persons, or persons by faith?* No rather when wee see so great mē fall, wee that stand must settle our selues better, *vt qui stat videat ne cadat*, we should rather follow the exāple of thousands in the Church who stand, then of a few light headed persons, who out of ambition, enuie, or desire of licentious libertie, do fall blindlie, or wilfullie. This Admonition (Gentle Reader) I thought good to ioine to this Translated Censure, that by the Admonition thou maist be armed and strengthned against the tentation and ill example of his fall, and by the Censure maist be informed of the falsitie and impietie of his booke and doctrine, that so neither his example may scandalize thee, nor his booke deceiue thee.

Tertul. l. præscrip. in initio.

Rom. 11.

THE CENSVRE

of the ſacred faculties of Diuinitie at Paris, againſt the foure bookes concerning the Eccleſiaſticall commonwealth, made by Marcus Antonius de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalata:

ALL they which know the naturall diſpoſition of hereſie, doe eaſily acknowledge, that ſhe imitateth the nature and ſubtilitie of a ſerpent; For as the ſerpent beſides the deadlie poiſon which he caſteth on everie ſide, doth alſo often writhe and turne backe his tayle to his head, either whilſt he gathereth all his anger together, or vehemently ſtirreth vp his benummed & languishing forces: So alſo hereſie when ſhe hath aſſaied to creep and inſinuate her ſelf into many articles of the faith, and yet ſhall perceaue that she hath nothing at all preuailed, but only in vaine hath ſpued and loſt hir poiſon, out of hir lither and

ſpent

ſpent bodie, is wonte at length like a ſerpent to returne to her firſt beginning, by very ſubtill crooked windings from the tayle to the head, and to encourage her ſelf to a newe rage and furie. This being apparently knowen to be true, almoſt in all hereſies, whoſe beginnings & endings haue been like, and alwayes aimed at the ſelfe ſame marke, both in their end, & entraunce, moſt euidently appeareth in this hereſie, which in our vnhappie age hath been raiſed vp from the darke dungeon of hell it ſelf. For wheras in the yeare of our Lord 1517. that wicked Apoſtata Martin Luther, violating not only the Cloyſter of the Monaſterie, wherein he had many yeares continued, but alſo breaking the bounds of Chriſtian modeſtie, began to publish many impudent cõtumelies agaynſt the chief Bishop of the vniuerſall church: and laboured not only to weaken and diminish, but alſo vtterly to ouerthrow his ſupreame authoritie: and yet this peſtilent hereſie in many countreyes, ſpent, cõſumed, and dying, haſtned by Gods prouidence to an vtter deſtru-

deſtruction: behold, after an hundred yeares expired, namely, this yeare of our Lord, 1617. another Apoſtata and traiterous rebell agaynſt the church, hath boldly ſtept abroade, and conſulting with himſelf, how to renew the ſame falling away from the church, and the generall vicar of Chriſt vpon earth, hath preſumed by hereticall temerity to publiſh an impious booke, altogether filled with innumerable hereſies. VVherein perhaps we haue cauſe to feare, leſt more perill & hurte may redounde and fall vpon the church, then in times paſt befell by Luther, not ſo much becauſe the Lutheran ſchiſme began from one wicked Fryer, & this ſchiſme from a man masked with diuers titles, and aduaunced with great Eccleſiaſticall honors, but alſo becauſe we knowe by experience (to the great grief of all good men) that in diuers places, many bearing the outward name of Catholikes, doe not giue ſuch reuerend reſpect as were conuenient, to the ſupreme Paſtour in the church of Chriſt. wherfore the faculty of Paris not forgetting her duty,

duty, and walking in the ſtepps of her Auncestors, who with great diligence haue laboured to giue publicke Iudgment agaynſt all errors what ſoeuer, & knowing aſſuredly, that it is as great a ſinne in the ſight of God, for thoſe which without diſcretion will obſtinatly keepe ſilẽce, when iuſt cauſe moueth them to ſpeake, as for thoſe which impudently publiſh that which indeed is erroneous and falſe, hath reſolued to offer it ſelf as a wall of defenſe for the houſe of Iſraell, and with ſpeed to reſiſt this contagious miſchief. And whereas in the yeare of our Lord, 1617. vpon the 30. day of October, Mayſter Nicholas Yſambert Doctor and Syndicke of the ſame faculty, according to his office in a ſolemne congregation holden in the greater Hall of the colledge of Sorbon, after the celebration of a Maſſe of the holy ghoſt, according to the auncient cuſtome, had brought in, and preſented a Booke concerning the Eccleſiaſticall commonwealth, made by Marcus Antonius de Dominis, Archbyſhop of Spalata, printed at London by IOHN

BILL, Anno 1617. and had complained very vehemently againſt innumerable hereſies and errors, wherewith the whole booke aboundeth: and alſo to the end he might the more eaſily ſpread the poiſon of his peſtilent doctrine amongſt vnlearned men, did impudently boaſt, that the vniuerſitie of Paris held indeed the ſame opinion which he did, differing from him in words only, & the foreſaid Syndicke moſt humbly entreated the Theologicall facultie, to make choice of ſome out of their ſocietie, who might moſt diligently examine the forſaid worke of Antonius de Dominis, and moſt faithfully reporte thoſe things which they could finde therein, the moſt ſacred faculty graunting his ſupplication, named fiue Doctors of Diuinity, who ſhould moſt exactly note all the propoſitions of that worke, and make reference of them all together, at the next generall congregation.

Therfore the next Calends of Decẽber, the ſame yeare, in a ſolemne congregation at the Sorbon, after a Maſſe of the holy ghoſt, as the manner is, being celebra-

celebrated, the ſaid Doctors and Maiſters appointed did reporte, that they had attentiuely read ouer the ſaide worke of Marcus Antonius de Dominis, & brought forth before the whole facultie, ſuch and ſo many hereticall, ſchiſmaticall, erroneous, ſcandalous, temerarious propoſitions, offenſiue to godly Catholike eares, and eſpecially contumelious againſt the holie ſea Apoſtolique, the Roman church, and the chief Biſhop thereof, the vicar of Chriſt vpon earth and ſucceſſour of S. Peter, all taken worde for worde out of the foreſaid worke, ſo that long time was ſpent in relating theſe propoſitions, and conferring them with the worke itſelf.

VVhich propoſitions being heard, & the whole matter being by the Deane of the ſaid Facultie, brought into conſultation and maturely conſidered of, the ſaid Facultie

Hath firſt giuen iudgement, that the foreſaid worke concerning the Eccleſiaſticall common wealth, made by Marcus Antonius de Dominis, is to be condemned, accurſed, & vtterly forbidden

to all Christian people, as altogether cõtrarie to the lawe of God, to the auncient Canons of the church, to the doctrine of the auncient Fathers, to the tradition and practise of the Catholike church, hereticall, euery where filled with most impudent slaunders, errors, and innumerable lyes, tending to the subuersion of the whole Hierarchicall order, as for such, the said Faculties actually condemneth and accurseth it.

Secondly, it hath giuen iudgement, that amongst soe many, and so great heresies, errors, slaunders, lyes, and other monstrous things of that kinde, some should be picked out from the rest, and noted with particular censure, that by these few euery man may easilie perceaue how iustlie the former worke hath been condemned, and how contagious, yea howe execrable & detestable it is.

Thirdly, it hath giuen iudgement, that all the Prelats and ciuill Magistrats of the Catholike church are most humbly to be entreated, and by the bowels of the mercie of God to be requested, that

that they will forbid Christian people from reading and keeping the foresaid worke, & if neede be, that they adioine censures and Ecclesiasticall paines to their so iust prohibition. And last y, to the end, that the cõdemnation of this worke should be knowen to all men, it hath decreed that this censure should be publickly imprinted.

Giuen at Paris in our generall congregation celebrated at the colledge of Sorbon, in the yeare of our Lord, 1617. of December.

By the Commaundement of the Deane and Maisters of the sacred Facultie of Diuinie in Paris.

PHILIP. BOVVOT.

CERTAINE PROPOSITIONS

chosen out amongst innumerable others, out of the foure first bookes of the Ecclesiasticall common wealth, made by Marcus Antonius de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalata, and condemned by the sacred Faculties of Diuines in Paris.

IN THE DECLARATION of the causes of his iourney.

THE church vnder the Roman Byshop is not a church any longer, but a certaine humane commonwealth, altogether vnder the temporall Monarchie of the Pope, it is a vine only to make Noe drunken, it is a flocke which the shepheard may sucke to the verie blood, fleece, yea shaue, yea flea, and murther.

This proposition in the first parte of it is heretical, for it saith, that the true church, which indeed is noe other but that onlie which obeyeth the Byshop of Rome, is already peri-

erished: but in the ſecond parte therof, it is slaunderous and ſcandalous.

The firſt booke 1. chap. 1. number

THEY which ſpeake concerning the Eccleſiaſticall commonwealth, as of things merely humane, ſeeme to me to erre much from the right pathe, not onlie becauſe they require a true iuriſdiction therein, that is, coactiue authoritie, and externall ſubiection, whereas, *All the glorie thereof is within.*

This propoſition in that parte wherein it denieth to the church, true Iuriſdiction, that is coactiue authority & externall ſubiection, is hereticall, and perturbeth the whole Hierarchicall order, & breedeth Babilonicall confuſion in the church.

The 13. number

ALl mortall Prieſts in the church of Chriſt, whoſoever they be, are not ſo much ſayd to offer ſacrifice properly, which Chriſt only hath trulie and properly offered, as to celebrate a memory of that ſacrifice (*Doe this in remembraunce*

braunce of me.)

This propoſition if it meane, that the action of Prieſts, when they celebrate Maſſe, is not a true and proper ſacrifice, is hæreticall.

The 2. chap. 7 number.

THe Apoſtles ſay, *we will be inſtant in prayer, and in the miniſtery of the worde*, they doe not ſay, we will occupie our ſelues in making coactiue lawes and tribunals, we will be inſtant in commaunding according to our pleaſure, in punishing, in ruling, but in prayer, and the miniſtery of the worde; becauſe they did not acknowledge any other office committed vnto them.

This propoſition is hæreticall in thoſe wordes: becauſe they did not acknowledge anie other office committed vnto them.

The 3. chapt. 18. number.

THat the inequalitie of Authoritie amongeſt the Apoſtles, is an humane inuention, not eſtabliſhed in the holie goſpels, and diuine ſcriptures of the new Teſtament.

This

This propoſition is hereticall, and ſchiſmaticall, being vnderſtood of the ordinarie iuriſdiction of the Apoſtles, which was eſtabliſhed in S. Peter onely.

33. number.

THat the forme of Monarchie was not immediatly inſtituted by Chriſt in the church.

This propoſition is hereticall, ſchiſmaticall, tending to the ſubuerſion of Hierarchicall order, and troubleſome to the peace of the church.

The 4. chap. the 2. number.

IF we ſpeake of a true and proper vicar, who hath moſt perfectly ſupplied the office of Chriſt, after his aſcenſion into heauen, and doth ſupplie the ſame vpon earth, and will alwayes ſupplie it to the end of the world; who doubteth, but it is the holie ghoſt the Paraclete.

This propoſition is erroneous and daungerous, and expreſſely ſauouring of the hereſie of Macedonius, in this worde.

vicar, *properly taken.*

The 6. chap. 35. number.

PEter almoſt immediatly after, fell from the ſelfe ſame faith, *namely after he had confeſſed the deitie of Chriſt*: *Math.* 16. and he ſtaggered not onlie once, but verie often, euen after the aſcenſion of Chriſt, and deſcending of the holie ghoſt.

This propoſition is erroneous, temerarious, and reproachfull againſt bleſſed S. Peter.

The 8. chap. 10. number.

Feed *my sheep*, that is, the Iſraëlites, who at that time were Chriſts only ſheep, whereupon alſo he ſaid, *I am not ſent but to the sheep which were loſt of the houſe of Iſrael*, and Paul calleth our Lord him ſelf *a miniſter of the circumciſion*.

This propoſition in the word (only Iſraëlites) *is heretical, and bewraieth the moſt groſſe ignoraunce of the author.*

The 12. chapter, 5. number.

ALthough *the articles of Iohn Hus*, did containe ſomething like my aſſertions, yet they were not condemned

ned lawfullie, becauſe the particular examination of them all doth not appeare.

This propoſition is falſe, erroneous, and contumelious againſt the councell of Conſtance, as if it had not proceeded lawfullie in condemning the errors of the Huiſſits.

In the ſame number.

The doctrine contained in the articles of Iohn Hus, namely, that in the church there is not one ſupreame head and Monarch, beſides Chriſt: that Chriſt doth perfectlie rule and gouerne his church by manie Miniſters without this one mortall Monarch, is Catholike doctrine excellentlie expreſſed and confirmed by the holy Fathers.

This propoſition is hereticall in euerie parte thereof.

The 12. number.

IF Ariſtocracie haue any diſcommoditie, which Monarchie may eaſilie helpe; that the church inſtructed by the ſpirit of Chriſt, would therfore that in euery church there ſhould be a Monar-

chie, and in the whole church an Aristocracie.

This proposition is hereticall and schismaticall, in that it will haue the vniuersall church, according to the totalitie thereof to be Aristocraticall.

The 42. number.

GOD hath promised his spirit to the whole church, not binding it to certaine persons, or to any certaine kinde of persons, namely to Priests only, or other Clergie men deputed to ecclesiasticall ministeries, but he would that it should be diffused through all, though not through euery particular person: and the consent of the whole church in any article, is vnderstood no lesse in laymen then in Priests, and Prelats. For laymen allso are in the church, yea they are of the church, & doe make a solid and greater parte thereof.

This proposition is hereticall, and perturbeth the state of the church, in that it requireth the consent of laymen to establish the articles of faith.

The

The 2. booke, chap. 9. number 9.

AS the Apoſtles together and wholie gouerned the church Ariſtocraticallie with equall and vniuerſall power, ſo all Biſhops doe gouerne the ſame church, euerie one of them with full authoritie.

This propoſition is hereticall, and ſchiſmatical in theſe laſt wordes, euerie one of them with full power.

The 13. number.

BIſHOPS are called the Apoſtles ſucceſſors, becauſe in their office, which was common to all the Apoſtles, they ſucceed all to all wholie.

It is an hereticall, and ſchiſmaticall propoſition, teaching thus concerning the authoritie of Apoſtolicall iuriſdiction.

The 15. number.

NOT only all Biſhops vniuerſally, but alſo euery one of them doe ſucceed in vniuerſall authoritie.

It is an hereticall, and ſchiſmaticall propoſition, as the two former be.

The 4. chap. 17. number.

VVE haue nothing at all cõcerning order, whereby the institution thereof in the nature of a Sacrament may appeare.

This proposition is heretical, scandalous, and reprochfull to the state of Priests and Bishops.

The 26. number.

ORDER is not a true sacrament, but a meere deputation to the ministerie, without these characters and impressions.

This whole proposition is hereticall according to both the partes thereof, both as it denieth order to be a true sacrament, and also as it affirmeth that no character is imprinted thereby.

The 27. number.

IF any man from a layman or deacon, or from any other degree below Priesthood, be immediatly ordained Bishop, he shall be Bishop in all perfection, and by such ordination he hath also all the authoritie of a Priest.

This

This propoſition is hereticall, and ſcandalous, intending thãt ſome men may be promoted to a biſhopricke, per ſaltum.

The 33. & 41. number.

AVGVSTIN acknowledgeth two true and proper Sacraments, which may appeare to haue been clearly & expreſſly inſtituted by Chriſt.

This propoſition is falſe and contumelious againſt bleſſed S. Auguſtin.

The 6. chap. 16. number.

LET this our ridiculous God, or vicegod tell me, if no man beſides him can tranſlate a Biſhop from one church to an other.

This propoſition is contumelious, ſcandalous, and offenſiue to godlie eares.

The 8. chap. 13. number.

I ſay that the Roman church both by reaſon of the greatnes of the citie, and becauſe the two chief Apoſtles Peter & Paule founded it, and for other reaſons not grounded in the lawe of God, hath had ſuch honour, that it hath alwayes been

been accounted a principall church, yet not the Ladie and Queene ouer all the churches of Christ: Neither Augustin nor any of the more auncient Fathers haue established the principalitie of Ecclesiasticall affaires in the Romã chaire; therfore it was, and is a chief church, in nobilitie, estimation, name, and authoritie of dignitie, not in the principalitie of regiment and iurisdiction.

This proposition is hereticall and schismaticall, in that it openlie insinuateth that the Roman church by the law of god, hath not authoritie vpon other churches.

The 10. chap. in the title.

THAT sacred Ministers art not bound by law to a single life.

This proposition is hereticall and troublesome to the estate of Clergiemen, and to the whole Christian commonwealth.

The 70. number.

ALTHOVGH Bishops hauing brought this custome in, that if they were married after their promotion, they should cease from the act of mariage, yet

yet they did it not of religion or caution, as if they thought that it was not now lawfull for them to doe it, but of deuotion, and loue of more perfect puritie &c. yet all the Priests, who are by much the greater nũber, embraced not this deuotion, but only those which willingly would by their owne free choice. And so it remained free to Priests, that they which could receiue it, should receiue it.

This proposition in the first parte of it, is false and erroneous: but in the second parte of it where it saith that Marriage remayned free for Priests *it is hæreticall.*

The 40. number.

SINGLE life dependeth vpon the free will and election of Clergie men; and if any man contract matrimonie after sacred orders, it shalbe firme & lawfull.

This proposition is hereticall, in that it is repugnant to the custome, and consent of the vniuersall Church.

The 43. number.

VVE conclude first, that the solemne vowe of Monkes, if it be of

anie more force then the ſimple vowe of the ſaid Monkes, who haue embraced Monaſticall life, that the whole efficacie thereof is only by eccleſiaſticall conſtitution.

VVe conclude ſecondly, that theſe ſolemnities (*namely of a vowe*) doe indeed hinder & forbid, that matrimony ſhould be contracted: notwithſtanding matrimonie contracted after thoſe ſolemnities, is not diſſolued by them, but is ratified, firme, and in force, as well in a Monke, as in a Nunne, as it is after a ſimple vowe.

This propoſition in reſpect of that ſecond parte; but being contracted it is not diſſolued &c. *is hereticall, ſcandalous, and troubleſome to the ſtate of the Church.*

The 45. number.

IF any profeſſed Monke by his owne authoritie without lawfull cauſe, become a reuolter from his profeſſion, he verily ſinneth before God, & hath damnation: but the Church hath nothing to doe againſt him in any externall courte; it hath only to doe with him in the courte of

te of conſcience for his ſinne: that he may not be abſolued except he returne, or if he be abſolued for a lawfull cauſe, although he be not to returne either by reaſon of irritation or commutation of his vowe. And if he ſhall marrie a wife, let him doe penaũce for his ſinne of reuolting, but let him remaine in his mariage: for he ſtandeth not in need of any further diſpenſation, hauing ſufficiently diſpenſed with himſelfe, by vndertaking a courſe of life, which cannot conſiſt with monachiſme, becauſe the bond of mariage is much more ſtreight, then the bond of profeſſing Monachiſme.

This propoſition in reſpect of the ſecond parte thereof, the church hath nothing to doe agaynſt him &c. *is hereticall: in reſpect of that other parte*, If he ſhall marrie a wife let him remaine in his mariage &c. *it is hereticall, ſcandalous, and troubleſome to the Church.*

The 3. booke, 7. chap. the laſt number.

THE whole ſcope of the Councell of *Trent* was this, that it might not only

eſtabliſh the Popes authoritie, being now verie great by innumerable vſurpations, but alſo that it might make it greater. For onlie the Pope and Rome only, gouerned, framed, and taught that Councell.

This propoſition is falſe, contumelious, and openeth a gapp to renew manie hereſies condemned in this Councell.

The 8. chap. 14. number.

THAT euerie Biſhop by the law of God is vniuerſall.

This propoſition is hereticall and ſchiſmaticall, & deſtroyeth the vnitie of the Church.

The 10. chap. 42. number.

CHriſt hath alwaies remoued Monarchie from his Church, and the Church hath alwaies abhorred it.

This propoſition is hereticall and ſchiſmaticall, tending to the perturbation and ſubuerſion of Eccleſiaſticall order.

The 44. number.

IT is falſe that the vnitie of the Catholicke Church doth conſiſt in the vnitie

vnitie of a visible gouernoure.

This proposition is hereticall and schismaticall, in that it denieth, that the vnitie of a visible gouernour is effectual to the vnion of the Church.

The 4. booke, 1. chapter, 1. number.

THE supremacie of the Roman Church, and the gouernment therof ouer all the Churches of Christ, is not indeed grounded vpon any sound foundations.

This is a false proposition, and openeth the way to heresies and schismes.

The 25. number.

PEter did not properly sit either at Antioche, or at Rome, hauing receiued his Apostleship not to sitt, but to trauaile vp & downe, and whether soeuer he went, he carried alwayes his chayre, that is, his episcopall authoritie, with him, which he had not tied to any certaine place.

This proposition is false, and sheweth the authors ignoraunce.

The 2. chap. 11. number

All antiquitie, as we haue ſeen, was vtterlie ignoraunt of the vniuerſalitie of the Roman Biſhopricke.

This propoſition is falſe as the former was, and sheweth the ſame ignoraunce of the author.

The 36. number.

IT is manifeſt that the *Roman Church is* moſt abſolutelie ſchiſmaticall, which then hath cutt it ſelf away from the bodie of the vniuerſall Church, when it refuſed to be a member of the ſame: and which is worſe, it addeth verie Antichriſtian tyrannie vnto ſchiſme, ſetting vp it ſelfe as a head againſt Chriſt, who is the onlie & true head of his Church.

This propoſition is hereticall and ſchiſmaticall.

The 6. chap. 2. number.

All bishops are indeede the full ſucceſſors of all the Apoſtles, euen of Peter. *And alitle after*: for Peter had not anie thing peculiar whereby ſucceſſion

ceſſion should be giuen to him, more then to all the reſt together.

The firſt propoſition in that parte, wherein it iudgeth, that all Bishops are the ſucceſſors of Peter, is captious: becauſe Peter beſides the power of order, in which Bishops ſuccede him, had an other power of Apoſtolicall iuriſdictiõ, whereunto the Romã Bishop onlie ſucceedeth. The ſecond propoſition is hereticall, ſchiſmaticall, and troubleſome to the Hierarchicall order.

The 7. number.

IT is plaine, that this Papacie is altogether fained, a deuice of men, & moſt remote from the inſtitution of Chriſt.

This propoſition is hereticall, as was before noted.

The 19. number.

I abſolutely denie, that the Biſhop of Rome is the peculiar ſucceſſour of Peter by any iuſt title, for by the law of God we gather, that the Biſhop of Rome can not ſucceede Peter in any peculiar reſpect.

This propoſition is hereticall and ſchiſmaticall,

ticall, and reprochfull against the bishop of Rome.

The 7. chap. 6. number.

THE fulnes of power, as the Parisians doe excellently teach, is giuen to the whole Church, that is, to all Bishops generally, and to euerie one particularly, in perfect manner.

This proposition is contumelius against the faculte of Paris, in these words, to euerie Bishop particularly.

In the same number.

LET them know also, that by the law of God, there is noe true iurisdiction in the Church, but that it is wholly gouerned by charitie &c.

This proposition is heretical and aymeth at the subuersion of the ecclesiasticall order.

The 9 number.

THE doctrine of the Parisians being clearlie vnderstood, differeth not at all from my doctrine conteined in these bookes, nor from the trueth. *and a litle after,* therfore the schoole of Paris is both

both on our ſyde, and indeed ſtudieth for an Ariſtocraticall, not for a Monarchicall authoritie; wherfore alſo by the doctrine thereof, the Papacie cannot be grounded vpon any ſound foundation.

A meere impoſture agaynſt the facultie of Paris.

The 8. chapter, 53. number.

BVT I alſo haue inſinuated out of the ſayings of holy Fathers, that an illiterate man & notoriouſly & infamouſly wicked, doth not receiue holie orders, and that holie orders may be loſt.

This propoſition is hereticall, and condemned amongſt the hereſies of the Bohemians in the councell of Conſtance.

The 10. chap. 11. number.

THE weſterne Councels, as the Lateran Councell vnder Innocentius the third, the Councell of Lyons vnder Gregorie the tenth, and the Florentine Councell &c. groaning vnder the yoake of the Eccleſiaſticall Monarchie now domineering, haue been compelled to applaude ſo great a Monarch.

This propoſition is falſe, ſlaunderous, and ſcandalous.

The 95. number.

VVE account Beda, Anſelmus, Hugo Victorinus, and Bernard amongſt thoſe of the Monarchicall faction, not being indeed deceiuers but rather deceiued: *and a litle after*, But we vtterly reiect in this cauſe, and in ſome ſorte we deſpiſe thoſe other later wryters, who were for the moſt parte paraſits and flatterers, faithleſſe deceiuers, contentious and prating diſputers againſt their owne knowledge and conſcience.

Theſe propoſitions be contumelious.

The 99. number.

BVT if any man obiect, that VVicclefs and Huſſes article concerning the Popes ſupremacie of them denied, was condemned in the Councell of Conſtance &c. we aunſwere that the Fathers of the Councell of Conſtance, made profeſſion of an Eccleſiaſticall Monarchie, & were infected with the error, which then was moſt common.

This

This proposition in respect of the last wordes, is hereticall and slaunderous agaynst the councell of Constance.

The 11. chap. 15. number.

IF, the Seate being vacant, the Canõs of Lateran, with the rest of the peculiar Clergie of the Roman Church, & conioined with the Senate and people of Rome, would choose a Byshop of Rome, and cause him, being so elected to be consecrated, by the Byshops neere adioining, although they were noe Cardinals, (if the Cardinall Byshops would refuse to doe it) he should be the true & lawfull Byshop of Rome, much rather then he whom the Cardinals in the conclaue should elect and consecrate.

This proposition is seditious, scandalous, and hereticall concerning the forme and manner of election.

In the same number.

WHERAS the Parisians doe make the Cardinals only to be electors of the Pope in the name of the whole vniuersall church, it is meere va-

nitie, becauſe they ſuppoſe that there is one vniuerſall Pope in the vniuerſall church, which ought to gouerne the whole vniuerſall church, as an vniuerſall Byſhop.

This oroposition is erroneous, the error whereof doth fall vpon theiſe wordes, Meere vanitie, *and in reſpect of that ſupposition wherwith he chardgeth the Parisians, it is falſe, and the falshood thereof falleth vpon theiſe wordes,* as vniverſall Bishop, *as if other Bishops were onlie the Popes vicars.*

The qualification of theſe foreſaid propoſitions was read and approued in the ſaid congregation of the Facultie of Diuinitie at Paris, and brought into this order the yeare and day afore named.

PHILIP. BOVVOT.

2 JY 58

Belley (M. de)
Examen du
Directeur, &c
1632